#### **REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Final Office Action mailed on December 1, 2004, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 21 and 29 are amended, no claims are canceled, and claims 35 and 36 are added; as a result, claims 1-36 are now pending in this application.

Applicant has amended independent claims 21 and 29 to more clearly recite the claimed subject matter. Insofar as the rejections apply to the original claims, including the amended claims 21 and 29, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 35 and 36 do not introduce any new subject matter and are intended to cover additional claimable subject matter fully supported by the originally filed specification.

### Claim Objections

Claim 30 is objected to because of a lack of antecedent basis for the term "method". The Examiner suggests instead the use of "device." However, claim 29 is a process claim and therefore, Applicant believes the use of "method" is appropriate. (See line 5 of claim 29 herein stating "transistor being formed by a process comprising steps of:").

#### §102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Hirai, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0047729). Applicant does not admit that Hirai is indeed prior art and reserves the right to swear behind the same at a later date.

In the office action, the Examiner cited page 3, paragraph 0056 to page 9, paragraph 0134 of the Hirai reference as describing depositing, in a rough pattern, the drain and source contacts, and refining the rough pattern by selective laser ablation of the drain and source contacts.

The Hirai reference appears to describe laser ablation of the source and drain electrodes of a transistor. (See Col. 5, paragraph 0064, of the Hirai reference). The Hirai reference does not describe <u>selectively ablating the semiconductor solution-processed thin film active region</u>.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claim 29, as amended, recites, besides other things:

selectively ablating the semiconductor solution-processed thin film active region.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that each and every element of Applicant's independent claim 29, as amended, is not described in the Hirai reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102 rejection for independent claim 29, as well as those claims which depend therefrom.

## §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 21-24, 27, 28, 31, 32, and 34 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirai, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0047729) in view of Kian, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,602,790).

In the office action, the Examiner cited Page 5, paragraph 0064 of the Hirai reference as describing patterning portions of the transistor structure via laser ablation. The Hirai reference appears to describe laser ablation of the source and drain electrodes of a transistor. (See Page 5, paragraph 0064, of the Hirai reference). The Hirai reference does not describe patterning portions of the semiconductor solution-processed thin film active region and the dielectric solution-processed thin film isolation.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claim 21, as amended, recites, besides other things:

patterning the semiconductor solution-processed thin film active region and the dielectric solution-processed thin film isolation via laser ablation, using laser wavelength tuned to be absorbed by material being patterned and to minimally damage material underlying material being patterned.

The Hirai reference does not describe patterning the semiconductor solution-processed thin film active region and the dielectric solution-processed thin film isolation via laser ablation. The Kian reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Hirai reference. The Kian reference appears to describe laser ablation of a conductor layer on a plastic substrate to form a plurality of electrodes from the conductor layer.

(See Col. 11, Lines 15-26). The Kian reference does not teach or suggest patterning the semiconductor solution-processed thin film active region and the dielectric solution-processed thin film isolation via laser ablation.

As such, each and every element and limitation are not provided in the references, either independently or in combination, to support a §103 rejection of claim 21, as amended. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection for independent claim 21, as well as those claims which depend therefrom is respectfully requested.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of claims 1-20 and 33. Additionally, claims 25 and 26 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 25 and 26.

Accordingly, Applicant has added new claims 35 and 36. Claim 35 is claim 25 rewritten in independent form and claim 36 is identical to claim 26. Upon this basis, claims 35 and 36 are also allowable.

# Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (541) 715-1694.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR §1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS AF Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 2644 day of 2005.

رے

-50

Respectfully Submitted, Jian-gang Weng, et al.

By their Representatives,

BROOKS & CAMERON, PLLC 1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500 Minneapolis, MN 55403

Bv:

Jeffery L. Cameron

Reg. No. 43,527

Date: